

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, and 20-29 are pending in the application, with claim 1 being the independent claim. Claim 18 is sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, written description

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 18, and 20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. *See* Office Action at page 4. Applicants respectfully disagree.

According to the Examiner, the claims were interpreted as being drawn to a composition comprising one or more peptides originating from any source or any kind of protein so long as the peptide(s) is eight to thirteen residues in length. *Id.* The Examiner concluded that the genus of peptides falling within the scope of the composition was unlimited in both structure and function. *Id.*

Not in acquiescence to the Examiner's rejection, but solely in order to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that the peptide eight to thirteen

residues in length comprises a CTL epitope selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NOs: 527, 673, 846, 627, 139, 859, 502, 53, 55, 807, and admixtures thereof. Thus, as amended, claim 1 requires that the composition comprises a peptide that is eight to thirteen residues in length *and* comprises one of the ten specifically recited polypeptides. Since the polypeptides contain the amino acid sequences recited in the claims, they are clearly not unlimited in either structure or function. In addition, each of these sequences is fully described in the present specification. Accordingly, the claims as currently presented are fully described in the present specification as filed.

In addition, the Examiner alleged that claim 18 requires that the peptides comprising the composition of claim 1 would be useful as a diagnostic reagent and that the specification does not support the genus of peptides meeting this criteria. *See* Office Action at page 4. Applicants respectfully disagree. However, solely to advance prosecution, Applicants have cancelled claim 18, thus rendering this rejection moot.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdraw of the rejection of claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, and 20-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Mita Mukherjee
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 54,325

Date: September 30, 2009

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

1030643_1.doc